

REMARKS

In the final Office Action, dated April 17, 2008, the Examiner rejects claims 30-34 and 47 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is allegedly directed to non-statutory matter; rejects claims 6 and 8-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0061211 to Schultz et al. (hereinafter "SCHULTZ"); rejects claims 1-4, 7, 11, 13-14, 16, 18-21, 30-32, 35-36, 38-39, 42-45, and 47 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over SCHULTZ in view of PCT Application Publication No. WO 02/15479 to Scarfe et al. (hereinafter "SCARFE"); rejects claims 12, 17, 22-26, 28, 40-41, and 46 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over SHULTZ in view of SCARFE as applied to claim 11, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0023489 to McGuire et al. (hereinafter "MCGUIRE"); and rejects claims 33-34 and 37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over SHULTZ in view of SCARFE as applied to claim 30, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,665,715 to Houri (hereinafter "HOURI").

Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.¹

By way of this Amendment, Applicants propose amending claims 6, 13, 18, 20, 21, 24, 26, 29-31, 35, 41, 45 and 47 to improve form. No new matter would be added by the present Amendment. Claims 1-4, 6-14, and 16-47 would be pending upon entry of the Amendment.

¹ As Applicants' remarks with respect to the Examiner's rejections are sufficient to overcome these rejections, Applicants' silence as to assertions by the Examiner in the Office Action or certain requirements that may be applicable to such rejections (e.g., whether a reference constitutes prior art, reasons for modifying a reference and/or combining references, assertions as to dependent claims, etc.) is not a concession by Applicants that such assertions are accurate or such requirements have been met, and Applicants reserve the right to analyze and dispute such assertions/requirements in the future.

Claims 30-34 and 47 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is allegedly directed to non-statutory matter. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The Examiner alleged that claims 30-34 and 47 can be considered to be software and are therefore non-statutory (final Office Action, p. 2). Without acquiescing in the Examiner's rejection, Applicants have amended claims 30 and 47 to address the Examiner's concerns and in order to expedite prosecution. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 30-34 and 47 under U.S.C. § 101 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 6 and 8-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly anticipated by SCHULTZ. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

A proper rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 requires that a reference teach every aspect of the claimed invention. Any feature not directly taught must be inherently present. See M.P.E.P. § 2131. SCHULTZ does not disclose the combination of features recited in Applicants' claims 6 and 8-10.

Independent claim 6 is directed to a method of providing documents that includes collecting location information associated with first users that access a resource, performing an analysis on the collected location information to determine a geographic relevance of the resource, determining second location information associated with a second user, and providing a document associated with the resource to the second user based, at least in part, on a matching of the geographic relevance of the resource to the second location information. SCHULTZ does not disclose or suggest this combination of features.

For example, SCHULTZ does not disclose or suggest providing a document associated with a resource to a second user based, at least in part, on a matching of the geographic relevance of the resource to second location information (where the geographic relevance of the resource is determined based on an analysis of location information associated with first users), as recited in claim 6. The Examiner relies on paragraphs [0014] and [0017] of SCHULTZ for allegedly disclosing this feature (final Office Action, p. 3). Applicants disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of SCHULTZ.

Paragraph [0014] of SCHULTZ discloses:

In accordance with another aspect of the present invention, after searching, the method further includes sorting search results according to a specified criterion. In certain embodiments, the specified criterion may be user selected or specified by program parameters to include criterion such as: (i) proximity of geographically defined query; (ii) closest information result, e.g., matching searched name; and/or (iii) advertising information associated with query. Additionally, the outputted search results may be displayed to the user according to various display options corresponding to the sorting criterion.

This section of SCHULTZ discloses a method of sorting search results according to criteria that may be selected by a user or specified by program parameters, and may include the proximity of a geographically defined query, a closest information result, or advertising information associated with the query. The search results may be outputted to the user according to various display options. It appears that the Examiner is relying on a geographically defined query entered by a user as allegedly corresponding to location information associated with first users. The Examiner also appears to rely on the search rank of a returned document in relation to the geographically defined search query as allegedly corresponding to the geographical relevance of a resource, as recited in claim 6. The Examiner also alleges that since SCHULTZ discloses location information for

multiple users, SCHULTZ discloses determining second location information associated with a second user (final Office Action, p. 3). Therefore, the Examiner is alleging that a second user entering a geographically defined search query corresponds to determining second location information associated with a second user. However, SCHULTZ does not disclose or even remotely suggest providing a document to the second user based, at least in part, on a matching of the search rank of a returned document to a search query submitted by a first user, as would be required by claim 6, based on the Examiner's interpretation of SCHULTZ. In other words, any documents returned to a second user are not in any way based on any geographical relevance of such documents to a search query entered by a first user. Therefore, this section of SCHULTZ cannot disclose or suggest providing a document associated with a resource to a second user based, at least in part, on a matching of the geographic relevance of the resource to the second location information (where the geographic relevance of the resource is determined based on an analysis of location information associated with first users), as recited in claim 6.

Paragraph [0017] of SCHULTZ discloses:

In another aspect of the present invention, a method for associating a geocoding system coordinate with a search criteria utilizing a search engine associated with a geographic information system database and an information database, includes: receiving a query from an associated user, searching for at least one search result, identifying the at least one search result corresponding to a specified geographic area, and providing the at least one identified search result to the associated user.

This section of SCHULTZ discloses a method for associating a geocoding system with search criteria and includes receiving a search query from a user, searching for results, identifying a result as corresponding to a given geographical area and providing the result to the user. Even if it can be reasonably assumed that identifying a search result as corresponding to a geographic area specified by a first user is equivalent to performing an

analysis on collected location information to determine the geographical relevance of a resource (a point Applicants do not concede), this section of SCHULTZ does not disclose or suggest providing a document to a second user based on identifying a search result as corresponding to a geographical area specified by a first user, as would be required by claim 6 based on the Examiner's interpretation of SCHUTLZ. Therefore, this section of SCHULTZ does not disclose or suggest providing a document associated with a resource to a second user based, at least in part, on a matching of the geographic relevance of the resource to the second location information (where the geographic relevance of the resource is determined based on an analysis of location information associated with first users), as recited in claim 6.

For at least the foregoing reasons, claim 6 is not anticipated by SCHULTZ. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) based on SCHULTZ be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 8-10 depend from claim 6. Therefore, these claims are not anticipated by SCHULTZ for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 6. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 8-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) based on SCHULTZ be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 1-4, 7, 11, 13-14, 16, 18-21, 30-32, 35-36, 38-39, 42-45, and 47 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over SCHULTZ in view of SCARFE. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Independent claim 1 is directed to a method that includes determining geographic locations associated with users that access a resource, performing a cluster analysis of the geographic locations to locate a cluster of the geographic locations, and storing an

indication that the resource is associated with a geographic area corresponding to the located cluster. SCHULTZ and SCARFE, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest this combination of features.

For example, SCHULTZ and SCARFE do not disclose or suggest performing a cluster analysis of geographic locations to locate a cluster of the geographic locations, as recited in claim 1. The Examiner admits that SCHULTZ does not disclose or suggest this feature (final Office Action, p. 4). The Examiner relies on p. 18, lines 5-14 and pp. 16-17 of SCARFE for allegedly disclosing this feature (final Office Action, p. 4). Applicants disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of SCARFE.

Pages 16 and 17 of SCARFE disclose a cluster analysis method to determine whether a given group of IP addresses fall within a cluster, by computing distances in a multi-dimensional space, such as an 8-dimensional factor space. The distance is the actual geometrical distance between objects in the factor space. The factors which are used as the dimensions of the factor space are given in Table 1 on p. 21 of SCARFE, and include factors based on types and length of packets, and the amount of packets sent within a given time period. Neither pp. 16-17 nor Table 1 of SCARFE discloses or suggests that geographical location can be a factor in the factor space. Furthermore, the factor space and measuring distances in the factor space cannot be reasonably interpreted as geographical distances, since the factor space is a mathematical construct bearing no relevance to geographical locations. Therefore, this section of SCARFE does not disclose or suggest performing a cluster analysis of geographic locations to locate a cluster of the geographic locations, as recited in claim 1.

Lines 5-14 of p. 18 of SCARFE disclose the detection of rare event criteria for data received by a firewall system. Such detection may include checking whether analyzed cluster pairings fall within cluster pairing conditions. This section of SCARFE is not related to clusters of geographical locations and does not disclose or even remotely suggest performing a cluster analysis of geographic locations to locate a cluster of the geographic locations, as recited in claim 1.

Therefore, even if SCARFE were combined with SCHULTZ, the hypothetical combination would not disclose or suggest all of the features of claim 1. Furthermore, even if, for the sake of argument, it is assumed that a combination of SCARFE and SCHULTZ would disclose the features of claim 1 (a point Applicants do not concede), Applicants submit that the Examiner's reasons for combining SCHULTZ and SCARFE do not meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 103.

For example, the Examiner alleges (final Office Action, p. 4):

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include clustering IP addresses based on location in order to tabulate where users accessing a particular web site are located.

Applicants submit that the Examiner's allegation is merely a conclusory statement of an alleged benefit of the combination. Such conclusory statements have been repeatedly held to be insufficient for establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness. In this respect, Applicants rely upon KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 550 U.S. ____ (April 30, 2007) (citing In re Kahn, 441 F.3d 977, 988 (Fed. Cir. 2006)), where it was held that rejections on obviousness grounds cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness.

Furthermore, as stated above, SCARFE does not disclose or suggest clustering IP addresses based on location. SCARFE discloses clustering IP addresses based on factors such as packet types and lengths, and the number of packets received in a given time period. It is not clear how such cluster analysis would be of benefit to a method of providing search results by a Geographical Information System (GIS) search engine of SCHULTZ. Furthermore, even if it is assumed that SCARFE does disclose cluster analysis based on location of IP addresses, it is not clear how such information would be used by the GIS engine of SCHULTZ, since SCHULTZ is not concerned with the user's location based on an IP address, but merely what they submit as a search query or through other user submitted information.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over SCHULTZ and SCARFE, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on SCHULTZ and SCARFE be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 2-4 depend from claim 1. Therefore, these claims are patentable over SCHULTZ and SCARFE, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 2-4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on SCHULTZ and SCARFE be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 7, 11, and 13 depend from claim 6. Without acquiescing in the Examiner's rejection, Applicants submit that SCARFE does not overcome the deficiencies of SCHULTZ set forth above with respect to claim 6. Therefore, these claims are patentable over SCHULTZ and SCARFE for at least the reasons set forth

above with respect to claim 6. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 7, 11, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on SCHULTZ and SCARFE be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Independent claims 14, 30, 45, and 47 recite features similar to, yet possibly of different scope than, features recited above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, these claims are patentable over SCHULTZ and SCARFE, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least reasons similar to the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 14, 30, 45, and 47 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on SCHULTZ and SCARFE be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 16 and 18-21 depend from claim 14. Therefore, these claims are patentable over SCHULTZ and SCARFE, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 14. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 16 and 18-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on SCHULTZ and SCARFE be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 31 and 32 depend from claim 30. Therefore, these claims are patentable over SCHULTZ and SCARFE, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 30. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 31 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on SCHULTZ and SCARFE be reconsidered and withdrawn. Moreover, these claims are patentable over SCHULTZ and SCARFE for reasons of their own.

For example, claim 32 recites that a geographic relevance component additionally determines a probability that a location associated with a user that submitted a search query is geographically relevant to documents in the set of documents based on a statistical model applied to the one or more clusters. SCHULTZ and SCARFE, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest this feature. The Examiner relied on paragraph [0014] of SCHULTZ and on p. 11, lines 8-18 of SCARFE for allegedly disclosing this feature (final Office Action, p. 8). Applicants disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of SCHULTZ and SCARFE.

Paragraph [0014] of SCHULTZ was reproduced above. This section of SCHULTZ discloses a method of sorting search results according to criteria that may be selected by a user or specified by program parameters, and may include the proximity of a geographically defined query, a closest information result, or advertising information associated with the query. The search results may be outputted to the user according to various display options. This section of SCHULTZ does not disclose or suggest applying a statistical model to one or more clusters. Therefore, this section of SCHULTZ cannot disclose or suggest that a geographic relevance component additionally determines a probability that a location associated with a user that submitted a search query is geographically relevant to documents in the set of documents based on a statistical model applied to the one or more clusters, as recited by claim 32.

Lines 8-18 on p. 11 of SCARFE disclose a classifying means and a comparing means, which together perform analysis on clusters of IP addresses and rare pairings of clusters. This section of SCARFE does not disclose or suggest determining the probability that a location associated with a user is geographically relevant to documents

in a set of documents. This section of SCARFE discloses analyzing clusters of IP addresses based on factors which are not related to geographical location. Therefore, this section of SCARFE does not disclose or suggest that a geographic relevance component additionally determines a probability that a location associated with a user that submitted a search query is geographically relevant to documents in the set of documents based on a statistical model applied to the one or more clusters, as recited by claim 32.

Moreover, the Examiner has not indicated how the method disclosed in paragraph [0014] of SCHULTZ could be combined with the method of lines 8-18 of p. 11 of SCARFE to suggest the features of claim 32. Even if SCARFE disclosed a statistical model, this would be directed to determining clustering of IP addresses based on factors such as number of packets in a given time period or the types or sizes of packets received, and would not be related to sorting search results according to a geographical search query.

For at least these additional reasons, Applicants submit that claim 32 is patentable over SCHULTZ and SCARFE, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination.

Independent claim 35 is directed to a method for determining a probability that a user submitting a search query is geographically relevant to a network resource. The method includes determining a geographic location associated with the user, acquiring geographic relevance information for the network resource, the geographic relevance information including information that defines at least one cluster associated with the network resource, the information defining the at least one cluster including at least a center point of the cluster and a measure of dispersion of the cluster, determining the probability that the user is geographically relevant to the network resource based on a

statistical model applied to the at least one cluster, and returning search results to the user based on the determined probability. SCHULTZ and SCARFE, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest this combination of features.

For example, SCHULTZ and SCARFE do not disclose or suggest acquiring geographic relevance information for a network resource, the geographic relevance information including information that defines at least one cluster associated with the network resource, the information defining the at least one cluster including at least a center point of the cluster and a measure of dispersion of the cluster, as recited in claim 35. The Examiner relies on p. 18, lines 5-14, pp. 16-17, and p. 11, lines 8-18 of SCARFE for allegedly disclosing this feature (final Office Action, p. 8). Applicants disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of SCARFE.

Lines 5-14 of p. 18 of SCARFE disclose the detection of rare event criteria for data received by a firewall system. Such detection may include checking whether analyzed cluster pairings fall within cluster pairing conditions. This section of SCARFE does not disclose or suggest a center point for a cluster or a measure of dispersion for a cluster. Furthermore, this section of SCARFE is not related to geographical relevance. Therefore, this section of SCARFE does not disclose or suggest acquiring geographic relevance information for a network resource, the geographic relevance information including information that defines at least one cluster associated with the network resource, the information defining the at least one cluster including at least a center point of the cluster and a measure of dispersion of the cluster, as recited in claim 35.

Pages 16-17 of SCARFE disclose a cluster analysis method to determine whether a given group of IP addresses fall within a cluster, by computing distances in a multi-

dimensional space, such as an 8-dimensional factor space. The distance is the actual geometrical distance between objects in the factor space. The factors which are used as the dimensions of the factor space are given in Table 1 on p. 21 of SCARFE, and include factors based on types and length of packets, and the amount of packets sent within a given time period. Neither pp. 16-17, nor Table 1 of SCARFE discloses or suggests that geographical location can be a factor in the factor space. Furthermore, this section of SCARFE does not disclose or suggest a center point for a cluster or a measure of dispersion for a cluster. Therefore, this section of SCARFE does not disclose or suggest acquiring geographic relevance information for a network resource, the geographic relevance information including information that defines at least one cluster associated with the network resource, the information defining the at least one cluster including at least a center point of the cluster and a measure of dispersion of the cluster, as recited in claim 35.

Lines 8-18 of p. 11 of SCARFE disclose a classifying means and a comparing means, which together perform analysis on clusters of IP addresses and rare pairings of clusters. This section of SCARFE does not disclose or suggest a center point for a cluster or a measure of dispersion for a cluster. Furthermore, this section of SCARFE is not related to geographical relevance. Therefore, this section of SCARFE does not disclose or suggest acquiring geographic relevance information for a network resource, the geographic relevance information including information that defines at least one cluster associated with the network resource, the information defining the at least one cluster including at least a center point of the cluster and a measure of dispersion of the cluster, as recited in claim 35.

Therefore, even if SCARFE were combined with SCHULTZ, the hypothetical combination would not disclose or suggest all the features of claim 35. Furthermore, even if, for the sake of argument, it is assumed that a combination of SCARFE and SCHULTZ would disclose the features of claim 35, Applicants submit that the Examiner's reasons for combining SCHULTZ and SCARFE do not meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 103, for the same reasons as given above with respect to claim 1.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that claim 35 is patentable over SCHULTZ and SCARFE, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on SCHULTZ and SCARFE be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 36, 38, 39, and 42-44 depend from claim 35. Therefore, these claims are patentable over SCHULTZ and SCARFE, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 35. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 36, 38, 39, and 42-44 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on SCHULTZ and SCARFE be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 12, 17, 22-26, 28, 40-41, and 46 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over SHULTZ and SCARFE as applied to claim 11, and further in view of MCGUIRE. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 12 depends from claim 11. Without acquiescing in the Examiner's rejection, Applicants submit that MCGUIRE does not overcome the deficiencies of SCHULTZ and SCARFE set forth above with respect to claim 11. Therefore, claim 12 is

patentable over SCHULTZ, SCARFE, and MCGUIRE, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 11. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on SCHULTZ, SCARFE, and MCGUIRE be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 17, 22-26, and 28 depend from claim 14. Without acquiescing in the Examiner's rejection, Applicants submit that MCGUIRE does not overcome the deficiencies of SCHULTZ and SCARFE set forth above with respect to claim 14. Therefore, claims 17, 22-26, and 28 are patentable over SCHULTZ, SCARFE, and MCGUIRE, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 14. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 17, 22-26, and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on SCHULTZ, SCARFE, and MCGUIRE be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 40 and 41 depend from claim 35. Without acquiescing in the Examiner's rejection, Applicants submit that MCGUIRE does not overcome the deficiencies of SCHULTZ and SCARFE set forth above with respect to claim 35. Therefore, claims 40 and 41 are patentable over SCHULTZ, SCARFE, and MCGUIRE, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 35. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 40 and 41 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on SCHULTZ, SCARFE, and MCGUIRE be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim 46 depends from claim 45. Without acquiescing in the Examiner's rejection, Applicants submit that MCGUIRE does not overcome the deficiencies of

SCHULTZ and SCARFE set forth above with respect to claim 45. Therefore, claim 46 is patentable over SCHULTZ, SCARFE, and MCGUIRE, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 45. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 46 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on SCHULTZ, SCARFE, and MCGUIRE be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 33-34 and 37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over SHULTZ and SCARFE as applied to claim 30, and further in view of HOURI. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 33 and 34 depend from claim 30. Without acquiescing in the Examiner's rejection, Applicants submit that HOURI does not overcome the deficiencies of SCHULTZ and SCARFE set forth above with respect to claim 30. Therefore, claims 33 and 34 are patentable over SCHULTZ, SCARFE, and HOURI, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 30. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 33 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on SCHULTZ, SCARFE, and HOURI be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim 37 depends from claim 35. Without acquiescing in the Examiner's rejection, Applicants submit that HOURI does not overcome the deficiencies of SCHULTZ and SCARFE set forth above with respect to claim 35. Therefore, claims 37 is patentable over SCHULTZ, SCARFE, and HOURI, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 35. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 37 under 35

U.S.C. § 103(a) based on SCHULTZ, SCARFE, and HOURI be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The Applicants respectfully request that this proposed amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 be entered, placing the application in condition for allowance. In addition, the Applicants respectfully submit that entry of this proposed amendment would place the application in better form for appeal in the event that the application is not allowed. If the Examiner does not believe that all pending claims are in condition for allowance, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of this application.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1070 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

HARRITY SNYDER, L.L.P.

By: /Viktor Simkovic, Reg. No. 56,012/
Viktor Simkovic
Registration No. 56,012

Date: June 17, 2008

11350 Random Hills Road
Suite 600
Fairfax, Virginia 22030
(571) 432-0800
(571) 432-0899
Customer Number: 44989